

MARY FERRELL FOUNDATION

preserving the legacy

www.maryferrell.org



Title: Orleans Parish Grand Jury Testimony of William R. Gurvich, 12 July 1967

Author: n/a

Pages: 98

Agency: n/a

RIF#: n/a

Subjects: n/a

Source: AARC



ORLEANS PARISH GRAND JURY
SPECIAL INVESTIGATION

JULY 12, 1967

William Gurrich

CC to [unclear]
100-2-68
Lien to
Alford 11/22/71

ORLEANS PARISH GRAND JURY

SPECIAL INVESTIGATION

JULY 12, 1967

PRESENT: MR. JIM GARRISON, DISTRICT ATTORNEY,
MESSRS. JAMES ALCOCK, RICHARD BURNES, ASSISTANT
DISTRICT ATTORNEYS

MEMBERS OF THE ORLEANS PARISH GRAND JURY

WITNESS:

WILLIAM R. GURVICH

(Second appearance before Orleans Parish
Grand Jury)

* * *

Reported By:
Maureen B. Thiel,
Secretary
Orleans Parish Grand Jury

MARY FERRELL
FOUNDATION
courtesy TPI

WILLIAM H. GURVICH, after being duly sworn by the Foreman of the Orleans Parish Grand Jury, was questioned and answered as follows:

MR. RICHARD BURNES:

Q. Please state your name for the record?

A. William H. Gurvich.

Q. Prior to testifying I want to ask if you have an attorney?

A. Yes. I have one outside.

Q. Have you consulted with him?

A. Yes.

Q. Are you aware of your Constitutional rights not to answer any questions that tend to incriminate you?

A. Yes.

Q. Are you aware that if you make an untrue statement it constitutes perjury?

A. Yes.

Q. And also stating a fact to be true that you do not know to be true?

A. Yes.

FOREMAN:

We agreed when you came in last time that we would not interrupt you, that you had the floor, and we would like to hear your story.

A. Yes sir. I must admit I did not know the exact purpose of the subpoena because I had read the newspaper article and that

was when I first learned about the subpoena, and it said it was issued by the District Attorney and not by the Grand Jury. I would like to know what the material, subject material matter is that you are interested in such as does it pertain to the assassination, is it an investigation of me or exactly what? I have been advised that I am entitled to this and I would like to know in order to clarify it.

FOREMAN:

Well when you came here - you sent me a telegram asking to let you appear here

A. Yes, that was a couple of weeks ago.

Q. That's right. We asked you to appear before the Jury and give your story a couple of weeks ago and when you came in you were worn out and tired and you said you would like to have some time to prepare yourself to answer questions and appear before us. We called your office on two occasions and I left my name for you to call me the following day and of course I asked the District Attorney's Office to subpoena you back again to let you come in and let you tell the story that you said you wanted to tell us. You told this to the press and to TV and you sent me a telegram saying you wanted to do it so we want to hear what you want to tell us.

A. As I said, I didn't understand , for I did not know the subpoena

came from you, I understood it came from Mr. Burnes. Mr. LaBiche, I would like to comment on this and I understand that I am entitled to do this. Following my last meeting here, according to the press, now this is hearsay, then again I was cross-examined or questioned about a newspaper ^{same} story that/out in a Long Island paper/you people accepted that as factual. Now I read in the paper here where some word came from the Grand Jury that I had lent nothing significant to the investigation, then when Mr. Burnes came out with his statement of a few days ago, the exact date I can't remember, he was asked a question as I recall by the news media do you think Mr. Gurvich will lend anything significant to this matter. He either said certainly not/or positively not. So if indeed this is the attitude of the Grand Jury and the legal advisors to the Grand Jury, then I would prefer not to have any comment.

FOREMAN:

But you

- A. If the legal advisor prejudices me and says publicly that I have nothing significant to say, certainly I am not appearing before an objective group pertaining to the District Attorney's Office. If, and I don't know for certain, I am saying it - you may clarify it, Mr. LaBiche, if any member of the Grand Jury did say that I had lent nothing significant to the matter.

when really my testimony was incomplete, as you say, I had waited 10 hours and I was tired and I was hungry. I was also under the doctor's care at the time but I did not mention this for fear it might look like an excuse. But if the Grand Jury feels that I have nothing significant to say then as far as I am concerned there is no point in my saying anything.

FOREMAN:

First, you asked to appear before the Grand Jury, you came in here and told us nothing.

A. I was not prepared.

Q. You told us that. We said we would ask you back and if you have something to say certainly we want to hear it. You told us you wanted to come back and tell us something. Now if you have something to say we certainly want to hear it.

A. Would it be appropriate for me to ask Mr. Burnes if he made the comment to the press? I realize that he is not under oath nor can he be placed under oath, but would it be appropriate?

JUROR:

Let me say this: Mr. Burnes has nothing to do with your appearing before us today. Any other statement he made he made out of the District Attorney's Office.

A. Is he your legal advisor?

A. Yes, he is our legal advisor. But that has nothing to do with your appearing here today. You said you had something to tell us and we want to hear it. Last time you said you were not prepared, you were nervous and upset and hungry and thirsty, and you had to get affidavits from newspeople, and one thing and another. You said you had something to tell now we want to listen to it.

JUROR:

Let me say one thing. The statement you read in the paper was made by us without the help of the staff, we made the statement, you appeared before us at your request, we heard you and you told us nothing. We heard many witnesses that day and much testimony and after the testimony everybody wanted a statement and at the end of that particular time we had heard nothing to incriminate the District Attorney's office. We made that statement, without the help or assistance of the District Attorney's office, in fact they were not in the room, they were out. That clarifies your point.

A. Yes sir. But on the way upstairs just now Mr. Burnes said it would not be long before you people would get me. Now what the hell am I doing here?

Q. You asked to come here, we have no idea.

MR. BURNES:

You asked me how long before we would get to you and I said it won't be long before we get to you because we had excused the last witness, I said, Bill, it won't be long - meaning that you would not have to wait long - and that is a false statement.

A. You are not under oath, I am.

Q. That was your statement and my reply.

A. You are not under oath.

Q. That is a point you had better realize.

A. I certainly do realize it.

JUROR:

Mr. Gurvich, we do not have you here to become engaged in a personality conflict with the District Attorney's Office. You said you had something to state as far as the case is concerned and this is what we want to hear.

A. Now that I know what the subject matter is, may I have a 30 second break with my attorney?

Foreman:

Yes.

MR. GURVICH:

Now its clear. I have been summoned here, in other words, if I have a story you want to hear it?

A. Yes.

Q. MR. GURVICH: I am not under investigation? Is that correct?

A. No.

Q. Is that correct, Mr. LaBiche?

A. Mr. Gurvich, you are a witness.

Q. But my purpose here is to tell you a story.

A. You are a witness otherwise you would not ask to appear before us, we would have asked you.

MR. GARRISON:

But you understand that the Jury will probably have some questions that they will want to ask you?

A. All right. Then let me start off this way. If I presented to you a notarized polygraph report, would you consider it?

FOREMAN:

Yes.

MR. GURVICH:

Q. Would you read it?

A. Yes.

MR. GURVICH:

would it be permissible to pass around extra copies in order to save time?

A. Yes.

JUROR:

Q. What is the firm of John Reid & Sons Associate?

A. It was my first visit there. I had been led to believe that

Reid & Associates was one of the most renowned in the nation in the field of deception and polygraph operation. These are qualifications that I cannot swear to, qualifications that Mr. Reid has presented.

MR. GARRISON:

Q. Who formulated the questions?

A. It was a combination of my attorney, myself and the polygraph operator, the terminology actually depends upon the polygraph examiner, each one has, I guess, his own particular technique.

FOREMAN:

Can we excuse you for a minute?

Yes. Now I do not know this to be a fact but these are his qualifications, he teaches and instructs at the Northwestern University and if you would like this I will leave it with you if you like.

(Exit)

FOREMAN:

Let's continue, what else do you have to offer?

A. Well, sir, if I am not under investigation and I have been advised by legal counsel to answer questions restricted to the material matter at this particular time.

MR. ALCOCK:

Bill, you have not alleged any violations of the law, and these questions can only pass upon violations of the law.

A. I am not an attorney and I won't get into a debate on the violation of the law, and what not. But I will do this, I will disagree with you. I think when a District Attorney, like Mr. Garrison, orders the arrest and physical beating and handcuffing of two newsmen, for no reason, as you well know,

Q. No, Bill, I don't know.

A. Well, you didn't hear that part.

Q. You better believe I didn't hear it.

A. But

Q.BY A JUROR:

Are you making this accusation?

A. Yes sir, I am, definitely.

Q. Let's hear it all. That's what we are here for. He is making that accusation.

A. Well, this is a material matter at the moment. It has been brought up, I will say that as it states in No. 2, I am saying it from memory now, that on May 17 the District Attorney did order the handcuffing and physical beating of Mr. - I am sorry I can't look at all of you when I say this - but you understand my position here - and arrest of Mr.

Sheridan and Mr. Townley, After having been advised by Mr. Alcock and myself that there were no legal grounds for the arrest and exactly what the violation would be if this were true on the part of the District Attorney I do not know. If I am qualified to say, I considered it to be wrong, I considered it to be frightening. Earlier on that day, the 17th, of May of this year, when I was to do this particular thing I could see no grounds for the arresting, I went down the hall and I talked to Mr. Jim Alcock who is honest and competent, and he asked the question what are the grounds for the arrest and I said I don't know, Jim, and he led the way back to Mr. Garrison's office and asked the same question, what would the grounds be for the arrest of these two individuals and as I recall it Mr. Garrison's words were, don't be so legalistic. That terminated that meeting, that was during the latter part of the afternoon around 4:00 o'clock. Later in the evening I met Mr. Garrison in the den of his home and he then, without the presence of Mr. Alcock, ordered the arrest again and the handcuffing and the physical beating. Mr. Alcock was not present then. He later accompanied me on a stakeout to see if Townley and Sheridan would violate any State statute. I think this was rather unusual for a man of Mr. Alcock's caliber and position, to be involved in a stakeout. But he did go. Mr. Sheridan and Mr. Townley did not

show, so therefore there was no arrest. If indeed they had violated some law it was agreed between Mr. Alcock and myself of course they would be arrested.

FOREMAN:

Do you know of one person in the D.A. office who gave a physical beating to? One person?

A. That they ever physically beat?

Q. Yes.

A. No sir.

JUROR:

Mr. Gurvich, will you correct me if I am mistaken, I remember when you came here the last time that you had brought up several things that did interest the Jury and we really want to hear them and I haven't yet heard them. Now, you dwelt upon the fact that there was a lot of browbeating, and you kept saying, let me get to the browbeating, let me get to the browbeating. Now, did you say that, or am I mistaken?

A. I don't recall exactly if that was my terminology. But basically it would have been, yes.

Q. Well, that is the point. I had the impression that you wanted to

A. Is that the only thing you wanted to hear?

Q. Oh, no, no. I think I am repeating it again, but we are interested in your entire complete story and what I would

like to do, so that you could be at ease, would be that you sit there and tell us your complete story, then we can go into this questioning business later. I would like to hear, and I think the members of the Jury would also, we would like to hear your complete story which you indicated you had. Am I correct in your indicating that you had a story that you wanted to tell us?

A. That is correct.

Q. Well, then, would you tell us your story in its entirety without any interruptions, so that then we can take up any pertinent or parts of the story that are/bordering upon criminal action. That is what we are interested in. We don't want to interrupt you, we want your whole story.

A. Well, Mr. LaBiche, as I first said when I first came in, I did not know that you had sent out the subpoena, I was led to believe that the District Attorney did. I actually did not know what the subject matter, what the material was going to be. You have explained it to me by saying I am not under investigation, that I am simply here so that I may tell my story, is that correct?

Q. Yes, that is correct.

A. I certainly wish I had known that when I came in.

JUROR:

When we left here two weeks ago you said you were going to need some time to get all of your information and that you were going to bring that back and that it would be affidavits, this and that, and you were going to give us the whole story and name names and that is what we left with and this is what everybody here expected.

A. I think that at that time

Q. And Mr. LaBiche said he would be in touch with you the next day, which was Thursday

A. I remember him saying that he would call me

Q. You were not in your office the next day.

A. I have not been attached to my office since last year.

FOREMAN:

When I called you the time before you answered me back.

A. Well, I was in town to get the message.

Q. You still get messages in your office?

A. If I am in town, yes sir.

Q. Have you been out of town since Thursday two weeks ago?

A. I don't remember exactly when I left, no sir.

Q. Well, Mr. Gurvich, do you have a story to tell us?

A. Yes, I have a story to tell you and I am not hedging on it.

As I say, I did not know you summoned me, that this Grand Jury summoned me. I just knew that Mr. Burnes made a remark to the local press.

JUROR:

Let us put it this way: are you prepared to tell us your story? Today?

A. Er ... I think I am, yes sir. But let me finish, if I may. You mentioned something before about sworn affidavits.

Last time I was here did you, or did you not, tell me you would not accept sworn affidavits? And then the questions came up would the witnesses themselves come in and appear under oath, and I said yes, and this gentleman said would they come at their own expense, and I said yes, I thought they would. Now, I didn't know why you wanted me here today, I might have suspected, but I didn't know. All I knew was what I had read in the papers.

Q. You said you wanted to come back.

A. I said I wanted to come back and clear it up. That was before about the witnesses. I want to clarify that.

Q. Do you have the witnesses?

A. I don't have witnesses in the hall - from around the nation.

Q. Do you have the affidavits?

A. No sir. I did not bring them with me.

Q. You don't need witnesses

A. No -

Q. you have a story,

A. That is correct.

JUROR:

Let us say again, if these people, these witnesses, can clarify anything, we will find them.

- A. Oh yes. Well, may I see if there is any material in my attorney's briefcase that I can bring in?

(Exit)

(continued)

MR. GURVICH:

- A. As you know, I have legal counsel and I have been advised to say that if there is no crime being investigated and that I am here in good faith, that actually I would be accomplishing nothing unless you are interested in pursuing some of the subject matter contained in this report that you have just read.

MR. BURNES:

Did you tell your counsel what transpired in here just now?

- A. I asked him if he had anything in the brief case that I could use, that is the purpose of my going out.

Q. Did you tell him what transpired in here?

A. What just transpired?

Q. Yes, did you tell him any of the questions that were asked you in the Grand Jury room any time today?

- A. I have to think about what we talked about. I went out twice. I would assume that I must have said something otherwise

there would be no point in me going out, to get this legal advice. This is what I said

Q. Do you know whether or not you told your counsel any of the questions that you were asked in here either in form or substance?

A. Any of the questions?

Q. Yes, either in form or substance?

A. I would say I did, yes sir.

Q. You told him what was asked of you and you told him what you answered?

A. When I went out to see him I went out to seek advice in order to answer something, so I don't imagine that I would have answered yes, that was the purpose of going out.

Q. Let me restate my question. Did you tell

A. You don't have to restate it, I heard it.

Q. I want a clear answer to it. Do you know, or you don't know

A. Am I being investigated, Mr. Foreman, is this proper procedure, I must know this.

FOREMAN:

Let me answer your question. I wouldn't have put you under oath when you came in if we didn't expect to get the truth from you. Otherwise, if you are not going to tell us the truth we want to know it then we would have had an informal conference anywhere. But this is a legal body and that is why

we explained your rights to you in here. So I think the question you have asked me is certainly in order. You were told that everything in this room is secret and you took such an oath, and you tell your questions and you break your oath.

A. And the secrecy pertains to your legal counsel?

Q. Certainly. It pertains to everyone. You have no right to discuss this with your legal counsel.

A. No, I didn't go out to discuss it, of course not, but he is asking me to give - if I told my legal counsel -

MR. BURNES:

Either the form or the substance of any of the questions and you answered yes.

A. Substance, yes.

Q. Now I ask you, did you tell him either the form or the substance of any of these/answers to questions?

A. Yes.

Q. You are conferring with your counsel on the questions and answers when you walk out the door?

A. Oh, no sir. Not solely that.

Q. That included among other things.

A. That included among other things,^{yes}/sir. As you put it.

I will say this: I thought I could do this. I certainly

would not have violated

FOREMAN:

Well, I would say you could not have done it.

A. Well, I am sorry if I did it.

Q. Now, let's proceed from here.

A. Well, as I said before, if it is necessary to repeat, if I can't delve into this particular subject matter at this time, I don't know really what I am accomplishing. May I

Q. Now let me tell you what you told us

A. May I be permitted to do this?

Q. Sure, go right ahead. We want to hear you.

JUROR:

May I quote something from the newspaper?

A. Of course.

Q. On June 4, 1967 you stated that the unethical practices in the D. A.'s office warranted investigation by the Parish or Federal Grand Juries. Is this a statement from you?

A. Well, now, I can't swear that that is factual/or accurate.

Q. They quoted you here.

A. I have never used the word _____ (inaudible) in my life.
it is not one of the words in my

Q. You said that in the Times Picayune.

A. And yet I have been quoted in the

Q. May I read it?

A. All right, but I don't mean to waste time

Q. Well then, tell us about it, go on.

A. All right. I have given you one example about Mr. Townley and Mr. Sheridan

Q. You said you didn't actually see this?

A. It was not done, I did not say it was done, I said it was ordered.

Q. Well, let's get back to the question.

A. Now Mr. Garrison has said publicly that I was a chauffeur and a part-time photographer, I consider that to be an outright lie. I don't know if he has been asked about that but then again he is the District Attorney. I have said that on a specific date this arrest was ordered, I have said that one of his qualified assistants told him there were no legal grounds and he said don't be so legalistic. If I may, I will again say that when a District Attorney uses an expression like don't be so legalistic, and falsely arrests people or arrests people without any legal grounds, I consider this to be indeed unethical. Mr. Alcock did, in my presence, in Mr. Garrison's office, oppose the arrest of Sheridan and Townley on legal grounds. The opinion of the

arrest of Clay Shaw - and once again when Mr. Alcock and I returned to the office our opinion was as Mr. Alcock put it, if he and I had been here Mr. Shaw would not have been arrested, he did not elaborate and say exactly how it would have been prevented. Did Charles Ward say to me that Clay Shaw's arrest was done on raw political power only? I would say under oath that he did say that. I would say the arrest of them was done on raw political power only. And this was unethical. I consider Mr. Ward to be a qualified person. The discussion of the plan to raid the FBI office, it is my opinion that it is highly irrational for any individual to become so seized with an obsession that his home, his residential and business phones are wiretapped by the FBI, that he would go as far as to get a search warrant and raid an office of the FBI office late at night looking for audio tapes simply on a suspicion. That I don't regard as rational and I simply keep saying I don't regard it. I have read the report in the master file of Mr. Sciambra's early interview with Russo, about the plan may I have a shot of water, I have an ulcer thank you very much and there was no mention in Mr. Sciambra's early report, interview report, with

Perry Russo in a plot to assassinate President Kennedy involving Shaw, Ferrie or Lee Oswald. When Mr. Garrison, and I don't know this to be factual, but I have been reliably informed that it was the Grand Jury that returned an indictment against Sergio Arcacha Smith and Gordon Novel, whether it was done by you people or done by a stroke of the pen of Mr. Garrison, I do not know. The point is these two individuals have been charged with a crime to conspiring to commit burglary in Orleans Parish. Mr. Garrison, in my opinion, charged or procured these bills of indictment from you people against those two subjects after having been advised that such a conspiracy would have been outside of his jurisdiction anyway. And I say to you that if indeed he were advised in such a manner and did get bills of indictment from you people, this Grand Jury, against these people, knowing better, I don't regard this as being ethical. The day Bundy took a polygraph test was the third day of the preliminary hearing back in March, 1967, when the results came in from the Police polygraph operators, who were not ordinarily used to run the tests, they first went to Mr. Ward, just a couple of minutes later Mr. Ward summoned Mr. Garrison, I happened to be with Mr. Garrison, and as we approached Mr. Ward's

office I was not permitted to enter. That meeting did not last very long. Shortly after that some of Mr. Garrison's key prosecutors asked Mr. Garrison or advised Mr. Garrison not to put Mr. Bundy on the stand. He ignored this advice which was his privilege and put him on the stand anyway. Reliable information, which I consider to be reliable, is that Mr. Bundy did not successfully pass the polygraph test and the operators are in this building right now, and I would suggest that sometime if it is permissible that you see them, Mr. Kruebbe and Mr. O'Donnell. If, indeed, he did flunk it and Mr. Garrison was so advised then he did not belong on the stand. I took a lie detector test pertaining to whether or not I have ever received or been promised anything of value, to say anything against Mr. Garrison. That is a lie detector test. I say to you under oath I have never been by anyone nor do I have any personal dislike of Mr. Garrison, there was a breaking point between us that came at the certain time, a series of events that culminated and nothing personal and I broke with him. I don't think I would have said anything publicly against Mr. Garrison had he seen me the day I tried to talk to him. I don't care about the newspaper article, on Long Island, I didn't give them the

story, they got it somewhere out of Washington, that I had seen Robert Kennedy . I did not give it to them. They did meet with me only after I learned that they had a story, already written, which would have been 90% inaccurate. I tried to have Mr. Bill Moyers, whom I did not know but who was the editor of this paper, to stop any such story. I was unsuccessful. But I have never been promised anything of any kind and I have no personal reason to say anything against Jim Garrison and it is not a pleasant thing to do, believe me. I said to you before that I thought it was wrong for the District Attorney, any district attorney, to mention to the news media the names of people like Mr. Garrison mentioned and classify them as conspirators or accessories after the fact. I gave them 3 names, the names are not in the polygraph report because I would not divulge the names even to the polygraph examiner. Therefore the terminology has been changed to read 3 prominent New Orleanians. They were William Boatner Reily, Alton Ochsner (Dr.), and William or Billy Monteleone. You ask me if I said in that article or accused him of doing things unethical, and I do now, in front of him and you. I say that if Mr. Garrison had reason to believe Mr. Bundy was not telling the truth and brought

him into court perhaps you can clarify that by summoning the polygraph examiners and asking them under oath what they told Mr. Ward. There is no collaboration between any newsman, any television network or wire service or anything like that and me.

MR. GARRISON:

How much are they paying you?

- A. Jim, I wish I knew how far I could go in answering that. I would not give you the benefit of citing me for contempt. But I'll call you this, you're a damn liar. And you know better.

JUROR:

That is not nice.

- A. Sir, I do apologize. Then again, this man is accusing me of accepting money, I am telling you under oath I have not, where is the proof that I did. I don't think he has any right to say I did, he knows better.
- Q. He asked you a question?
- A. How much are they paying me? I have said under oath, I have never been promised to receive anything of value. I said it before you asked me.
- Q. I would like to ask you a personal question? You participated in the investigatory work which preceded the arrest of

Clay Shaw, is that right?

A. No.sir. That is not correct.

Q. You were attached to the District Attorney's Office?

A. I was a member of it, yes.

Q. The preliminary hearing was held in March?

A. March 14, as I recall it.

Q. I recall that you attended a session of this Grand Jury on May 7, when Mr. Lane was here?

A. No sir, I did not.

Q. You didn't come before the Jury but didn't we all go to lunch together one day.

A. Yes, I went to lunch with you first. We went to Chris the first time and the place on Decatur the second.

Q. Well, all this business about Clay Shaw and all this is in the mill and Lane was here and the other fellow, the question I want to ask you is why did you wait until June to have the remorse of conscience that you did and start blowing the whistle on Garrison?

A. That is a normal and expected question.

Q. If you thought it was wrong in June, you must have thought it was wrong in March, April and May?

A. Well, that is your opinion, that is not my opinion.

Q. Well, you said it was wrong

A. I said

Q. If it was wrong in June it was wrong in May, April and March, as well in June. Why did you wait until June to blow the whistle?

A. I don't know what the breaking point is, sir.

Q. Well, what was the breaking point?

A. It was a matter of conscience. And I said I had enough and I went to tell him that I had enough, I wanted to talk to the man and tell him what my feelings were, and that I wanted to reviewed this and I had accumulated so much and I thought the thing was rather wrong and he would not see me and I was barred from the office until a certain gentleman in the office said come on in. I went to see him and

Q. All of a sudden you were barred from the office?

A. I went to see him and there was a policeman at the door, Mr. Ivon and he wouldn't let me in. And Mr. Alcock said come on in.

MR. GARRISON:

You had just come back from New York, hadn't you?

A. Yes, a few hours before.

Q. You had talked to Mr. Kennedy in Washington?

A. I had only talked to Mr. Kennedy, as I recall it

Q. And the news release was in that newspaper?

A. Yes sir.

Q. You talked to Senator Kennedy before you talked to Mr. Garrison?

A. Yes I did sir.

Q. You were working for Mr. Garrison?

A. Yes, I was working for Mr. Garrison.

Q. If you were working for me and you had something to say to me why would you talk to Mr. Albarado or Mr. LaBiche?

A. That is the way I did it - that is the only way I can answer that.

Q. Don't you think anyone would be a little offended by that? Don't you think you should have talked to Mr. Garrison first? If you don't like the way he is operating why not tell the man first? The man you are working for?

A. Well, I didn't tell Senator Kennedy to have Mr. Garrison stopped.

Q. What was the purpose of talking to Senator Kennedy?

A. Possibly to clarify some sort of confession. It was confidential.

Q. Why would you go all the way up to see Mr. Kennedy?

A. All I can answer is that was my own doing, I paid my way there and back.

JUROR:

I know that, I don't think there is any question of that, I

am just trying to find out what is behind your choosing
such

A. You have something, Mr. Burnes?

MR. BURNES:

Yes, I have

Q. Answer the question?

A. Well, I am trying to talk to the man, but he is waving a
pencil he doesn't have any better manners

Q. What I meant by my question is this: what prompted you to -
now you said a minute ^{ago} /there was no place for animosity
between you and Jim Garrison - and I take you at your word,
yet you tell me, as you have done, that when you had this
remorse or change of feeling in the matter you go all the
way up to New York or Washington to see Senator Kennedy,
whom I suspect you did not know personally ...

A. Oh, no, no

Q. Not as well as you knew Mr. Garrison

A. I had never met Mr. Kennedy.

Q. Then I am trying to figure out what prompted you to take
this avenue of approach rather than come in to the man
you had been working with for months? And was friendly with?

A. I never saw anyone successful with Mr. Garrison during many
months. I can only say this is my own doing and this is
what I did. If it isn't your way and I will admit it does
sound peculiar, but I did it. I do not recall doing it for

any ulterior motive other than I selected the brother of the dead President to tell that in my opinion this investigation would shed no light on his brother's death. That was my own doing. If you would not have done it that way then that would be your privilege.

JUROR:

Q. When you went up in that direction who did you see first, the Senator or Mr. Sheridan?

A. Mr. Sheridan.

Q. Didn't he write a story about you?

A. Mr. Sheridan wrote a story about me? I know of no story Sheridan wrote about me.

Q. You had to use an intermediary to talk to Senator Kennedy -- I presume you did not go up and just walk in his office?

A. Sir, last time you were absent, I said Mr. Walter Sheridan arranged the meeting.

Q. Which came first, the visit to Senator Kennedy or the newspaper story that appeared about your visit?

A. The visit.

Q. Then the story appeared in the paper? About your visit?

A. Yes. I inquired about how the story got out, I was in New York, and I was assured, or led to believe that Senator Kennedy didn't let it out, then a day or two passed, I don't know the exact time, and I was then asked do you remember

meeting a person at the Airport in Washington when you and Senator Kennedy were sitting in the back talking, and I thought and I said yes, I do remember a man or two coming over and having a few words with the Senator, were you introduced and I said yes, I was, and I was told that is about all it takes, your name was known and you were seen with Senator Kennedy, whether or not that is true, I don't know. I tried to stop the story.

JUROR:

What I want to say, you say your meeting with Senator Kennedy was confidential yet after the story about it you said it was about 90% inaccurate.

A. I said there were many, many inaccuracies, not in the written story, the story had not been written yet, but a man, the reporter, told me on the phone what he intended to write and I said where did you get such a story and he said well, that's what we are running, but I wanted to talk to you first, and I said I have no comment and he said that's our story and it will be out in a day or two, and I said you can't be serious.

Q. Didn't you think it strange that a confidential story would be out in the press?

A. Yes, that's what I am telling you, I inquired and was told that the Senator didn't let it out and ... you remember meeting

someone ... and honestly I don't know. I have suspicions, yes.

FOREMAN:

We wanted to have a question period after you had finished telling your story. Now we know what you said here, we got this, we all read it. Is this your story, what you wanted to tell us?

- A. It wouldn't be the story in detail, during my last consultation with my lawyer it was decided I would stick to this right now. If you prefer to go further then I would like a minute with him.

JUROR:

It was my impression that the last time you were here you had some information whereby there was malfeasance in the District Attorney's Office.

- A. I didn't use the word malfeasance.

- Q. Well, I was led to believe that you had something that something was going on that shouldn't have been. Up until this time I have have heard nothing. Do you have something where we can get started?

- A. And you say you have not heard anything

- Q. To make me think there is something wrong. That's all you say, what you have written here. You said somebody told you this.

A. May I ask a question? Did the Grand Jury return bills of indictment against Sergio Arcacha Smith and Gordon Novel?

Q. No.

A. It was a direct bill, is that correct?

A. Yes.

A. You don't regard that as anything?

Q. What?

A. A person being falsely accused - two people of committing a crime - after being advised and knowing they didn't do it.

FOREMAN:

Mr. Gurvich, these are attorneys they disagree with you.

A. Well, I didn't know they disagreed before me - and if they did I'm in big trouble.

Q. And Mr. Alcock here disagrees very strongly with what you say. In other words, like you twisted the words coming up here, Bill, it's the same way

A. Mr. LaBiche, how do you know I twisted the words if you didn't hear me?

Q. Well, I will say you twisted the words as far as he was concerned. He said you asked

A. I gave the substance of it.

Q. ... when they would get to you, obviously in our opinion he meant to get to you to come in here before the Jury, not to do anything to you. Now you come in here and told us he would get you .. which was a twisting of words.

A. I interpreted it as an indictment. I did not regard it that way.

Q. It was never planned to us to try and get you.

A. I have never accused you of that Mr. LaBiche.

Q. And none of us think that way except that we think you made some statements right here, and on the air, unquestionable things that happened in the District Attorney's Office which would definitely warrant an investigation of this office by the Grand Jury. Would you say these methods were illegal? I would say definitely illegal and unethical. These are statements that you made publicly. You sent me a telegram saying you wanted to come tell the Grand Jury these things.

A. And I'm telling you

Q. We are trying to get from you, and they are our legal advisors and we know we are not supposed to put them out of the room legally, but we are not scared of them by no means and when we deliberate we deliberate by ourselves. We think Mr. Garrison I asked you a good question, who did Mr.

Garrison instruct you to go out and beat up. I asked you one person that the District Attorney's office went out and beat

up and handcuffed?

A. I never have said he had anyone beaten. I said he ordered it.

Q. Now the only other person - you are saying this - you have a right to say it, you said you heard him say it and he said he didn't say it, and I sat here before with you and you said that you and him came back in town on this arresting you are talking about but he didn't agree with you that they had no grounds to do what they did, nothing like that. He told us the last time you were here he had ^{new} testimony, so he is bucking your opinion. And certain other people are contradicting what you are saying.

A. Well, I did not know it had been contradicted.

Q. And I think we can go down on some of these questions ...

A. Was it contradicted under oath, Mr. LaBiche?

Q. No, it wasn't.

JUROR:

Mr. Gurvich, you know full well these men wouldn't agree with you on that?

A. How would I know?

Q. You could assume that.

Q. You were quoted in the press, the Philadelphia press, I was in Philadelphia at the time, saying you thought Mr. Garrison was sincere in the probe. Did you say that?

A. Never in my life.

Q. Did you read that in the press?

A. Yes I saw it.

Q. But you didn't make the statement?

A. No sir. I said I think he sincerely believes in what he is doing.

Q. And that was in response to a question of the press ...

A. I don't know what it was in response to.

FOREMAN:

Now, Bill, you said you had something to tell us. And you said you wanted to tell it in here. Now, we wanted to hear it. This is your case right here, but what you have given us here, we want to know if this is your whole case? If it is your case, then all right, and we know what you got here.

A. No sir, that would not be all of it. I have been told for the first time that this has been contradicted, not under oath however. Something else was just said by this gentleman, referring to the Philadelphia thing, that certainly I would have known they would have contradicted me, or something to that effect. Certainly I would not expect anybody to contradict me - if Mr. Alcock or anybody of his caliber contradicted my remarks about the indictments of, or the

fact that Mr. Garrison was advised that two indicted or charged persons were so charged knowing that this alleged crime occurred outside the jurisdiction, I would be very amazed that somebody like Mr. Alcock would say this.

JUROR:

Do you know it to be a legal fact that these two men were outside the jurisdiction? Of the District Attorney's Office?

A. Yes sir.

Q. You are certain of this?

A. Yes sir. Mr. Alcock and I interviewed one of the principals in the matter.

Q. Who?

A. Mr. Rancier Ehlinger.

Q. What was the subject of that?

A. We tried to determine when it happened, then this conspiracy to commit burglary happened, and ^{he} ~~they~~ said when they met they met in Metairie at Mr. Ferrie's house and they left there after discussing it, and they did indeed travel to Houma and they did indeed commit a burglary, and they returned to the Metairie residence of Mr. Ferrie.

Q. Mr. Ehlinger told you this?

A. Yes and he told Mr. Alcock this too. I think that is in his written statement.

Not his written statement, but a typed statement that I assumed he signed.

FOREMAN:

Now you asked to tell us all of this. You are saying you told us all you want to tell us, and we have all of the information we need from you and I guess if you are through we can have a question period.

A. Will it be permissible for me to have a word with my attorney?

A. No, I would say you are on your rights. I asked the District Attorney to tell you your rights when you came here...

A. You mean about secrecy? I understood the secrecy, Mr. LaBiche, but I did not know it pertained to my legal counsel.

Q. I think the only right you have to talk to your attorney is pertaining to your legal rights.

A. Well I want to ask him about the rights of questions and answering. I want to clarify it if I am being investigated or if I have something to say and then decide that I have no further comment then is it my privilege or not.

FOREMAN:

You are not being investigated at this time.

A. You made that explanation.

Q. Well, we were concerned that you had statements to make and

we want to know if you are telling the truth or if you are lying and I think that is important and part of the record of the Grand Jury. We are going to investigate these matters and see if they are true or whether they are false. Some of them are hearsay, but you certainly say that Mr. Alcock has been involved, Mr. Ward says that Mr. Garrison did this as raw political power only, and again the FBI deal.

A. What is hear-say about that? If the man told me.

A. You said he told you, basically your word against his.

A. But I have witnesses.

MR. BURNES:

You say if Mr. Ward told you and not Mr. Garrison, therefore it would be hearsay.

A. Well, I said Mr. Ward said it and Not Mr. Garrison.

Q. Who were your witnesses, who was with you when Mr. Garrison discussed this?

A. Both my brothers, I would say my brothers Louis and Leonard, As I recall. And if I can think of others I will give it to you.

JUROR:

I think there is a little confusion in Mr. Gurviah's mind as to just what secrecy of the Grand Jury implies in relation to his attorney.

A. There is now, yes sir.

Q. I wonder if we could get a legal explanation to clarify that? I think you do not understand just what you can and cannot discuss with your attorney.

A. I evidently don't.

MR. BURNES:

Let me read this to you

A. May I say this, Richard, if you give me your opinion I will accept, you don't have to read it word for word, if you will tell me in your own words.

Q. I choose to read it.

A. Well I might understand it better the other way.

Q. When you first appeared before the Grand Jury you were given an oath to answer truthfully and to maintain the secrecy....

A. That is absolutely correct.

Q. Art. 434 reads as follows: Members of the Grand Jury and all other persons present and all other persons having access to information concerning the Grand Jury proceedings of witnesses shall keep secret the testimony/and all other matters occurring there and connected with the meeting of the Grand Jury, however after the indictment such persons may reveal to defense counsel, any irregularities in the Grand Jury proceedings,/the District Attorney or the court and may testify concerning them, such persons may disclose testimony given before the Grand Jury at any time with permission by the court to show

that witnesses committed perjury in their testimony before the Grand Jury. A witness may discuss his testimony given before the Grand Jury with counsel for a person under investigation or indictment with the District Attorney or with the court. Any person violating the provisions of this Article shall be charged with contempt of court. This provision applies to witnesses who discuss their testimony with their attorney only (1) if they are under investigation and (2) charged with perjury." That is the statement of the obligation of secrecy before the Grand Jury.

Q. And you are not under investigation.

A. You have made that very clear, Mr. LaBiche.

JUROR:

Has this document been released to the press?

A. Yes sir.

MR. BURNES:

Q. Was it intentionally released to the public before appearing before the Grand Jury for the purpose of avoiding the secrecy of the Grand Jury?

A. Now I want to consult my attorney. I am now beginning to feel, it may be an error on my part, but if I am not being investigated, I want to know just what I can say and what

I can do. I feel that I am being quizzed. May I consult my attorney?

Q. I'll restate the question and in the course of your reaching a decision

A. You haven't answered my question, who has the word here?

FOREMAN:

I have. Now, if you had something that would affect your rights

A. But this time you are going to deny my rights? Deny my right to consult my attorney - deny my Constitutional rights?

Q. BY A JUROR:

Let me inject something here, if the man wants to read the question into the record then you can come up with an objection.

A. Its not an objection.

Q. Well, we don't have a question yet.

A. Well, he asked one before.

Q. But you didn't answer him.

A. Well, go back to the first one then.

MR. BURNES:

Your recent decision, what you call expose the actions of the District Attorney's Office, did you gather your information from talking to witnesses or observing the conduct

of the office and the files of the cases?

A. No sir, I had never read the master file.

Q. You had never read the file?

A. No, until some time in June, toward the end of June and early part of July. And my opinions were based on 7 months of experience.

Q. Did you read the master file, or any part, prior to your appearance before the Grand Jury the last time?

A. I probably did, but not the master file. I have written some of the stuff that is in the master file.

Q. Have you read parts of material written by other members of the staff prior to the time of your last appearance before the Grand Jury?

A. While it was in the master file or while it was in separate files and being presented?

Q. At either time.

A. Sure I have seen reports.

Q. Do you have physical access to

A. When do I get an answer to my question about my Constitutional right? Now that you are going from one question to another and evade my point. When, Mr. LaBiche, may I have an answer?

MR. BURNES:

You are here to answer questions, not to ask them.

A. I know I am not here to answer your questions, Mr. Burnes.

I was told by the Foreman of the Grand Jury, Mr. LaBiche
may I have the ruling please? One way or the other.

FOREMAN:

No.

A. I cannot consult my attorney?

Q. No, not at this moment, no.

A. That's all I ask for.

Q. Did you have physical custody of any part of the file during
the investigation?

A. Sure. A file was made for me at Mr. Garrison's instructions,
yes sure.

Q. That is correct.

A. How do you know that is correct, Mr. Burnes?

Q. Did you have a physical custody of parts of the file, in
other words you could take it where you wanted to?

A. I would assume that I did, I don't know. Other people were
taking their files home, I didn't take mine home. But parts
of it, hell I always had a brief case, My God.

Q. Did you take any part of these files out of the District
Attorney's office? Or any copies of these files?

A. Yes, I said this under oath the last time I appeared.

FOREMAN:

We asked you the question had you returned that file?

A. I said no, that I regarded it as State property, and that I intended to return it, but I have not yet done it.

Q. At any time subsequent to the last Grand Jury meeting and the meeting today have you made any additional copies of this file?

A. Wait a minute - since the last meeting here - yes, I have.

Q. Have you made a complete copy of all those files?

A. Well, what I believe to be all of it, yes, this was on legal advice.

Q. By whom?

A. My attorney.

Q. How many copies of this file, or each of these files, do you have?

A. I do not know how many copies.

Q. You made multiple copies?

A. I don't know how many were made? I know one copy had been made and I had suggested that additional copies be made, in case the others were lost or stolen.

Q. What did you do with the one copy made? Did you make it yourself?

A. My attorney made it.

Q. Did he make it in your presence?

A. No, not in my presence, I gave it to him and he made it.

Q. For the purpose of making the copy?

A. A copy. I don't know how many copies were made.

Q. But you advised that additional copies be made?

A. I suggested that at least one more be made. Now if he made 10, I don't know.

Q. Who is your attorney?

A. Edward Baldwin

Q. The same person you turned the files over to to make additional copies?

A. Yes.

Q. Was it your intention to return the additional copies made?

A. No, if I needed them at a later date to corroborate any statements of mine or possibly use for my own advantage.

Q. Was any of these copies turned over to your attorney?

A. Mr. LaBiche, I still raise the question about my Constitutional rights, I still want to consult my attorney. It is an open question.

MR. BURNES:

Was the copy you turned over to your attorney for copying prior to your appearance before the last meeting of the Grand Jury or subsequent to the Grand Jury meeting?

A. Since, I would say offhand. Can you tell me the date I was here last?

Q. June 28.

A. Since then.

Q. You stated that you advised Mr. Baldwin to make additional copies, for whom was this one copy made, would you say it was made for you?

A. Solely for my benefit. To be shown to no one.

Q. For whom were the additional copies made?

A. For my benefit - to be stored in separate places. Different places.

Q. Do you know what duplicating processes were used?

A. I was told Xerox, but as I said, I didn't witness it.

Q. Who has the physical possession of these files and records at this time?

A. I couldn't attest to that, certainly I don't know where my attorney has placed them.

Q. Has he turned any of them over to you?

A. No, I turned them over to him. I have none in my custody.

Q. Did you suggest to him or direct him that these files be made available to anyone other than yourself and your attorney?

A. I told him no one was to see them.

Q. Other than yourself?

A. My attorney and myself.

Q. I would like to go into the area of

A. May I interrupt? Mr. Foreman, I am of the opinion that this

is not going into a story that I have to tell you and I feel like I am being investigated for some offense and once again I am asking to consult my attorney pertaining to my rights. I am being examined, interrogated and cross-examined by the Grand Jury, by the Grand Jurors themselves I do not mind this, but when the legal advisor of the District Attorney's Office does it and asks the questions that he does, I want to consult my attorney.

FOREMAN:

Until we get a question, Bill, that the Grand Jury asks you ..

A. The answer is no.

Q. The answer is no to those questions.

MR. BURNES:

While ago members of the Grand Jury asked about the time you became disenchanted with the District Attorney's Office ...

A. Haven't I been asked that, when I became disenchanted with the District Attorney's Office? And I told you.

Q. I want to ask you a couple of questions to nail down that particular time.

A. I don't know the exact time.

Q. You haven't answered my question. Now, my question is did you make the statement on television that you became a double agent and worked both for Mr. Garrison and for justice?

A. May I see my attorney?

FOREMAN:

Yes, but you are still under the oath of secrecy.

A. As I interpret it, I can't tell my attorney the last question that I was asked.

A. Absolutely not. Any questions that were asked.

A. But I may be permitted to ask him whether I can go into certain matters or not? Without telling him that you have already started it, is that correct?

A. I would think, so.

A. I won't tell him that you have already asked me that. I will simply say should I go into this matter, this matter ..

(Exit)

(Return)

MR. BURNES:

Mr. Gurvich, you said in response to Mr. Garrison's question that you had not received compensation from an outside source for this matter, is that correct?

A. Would you . . . compensation for what purpose?

Q. Payment.

A. For what purpose?

Q. You said, I believe, that Mr. Garrison said how much are they paying you , is that correct?

A. To do what - what I am doing now - or recently? Publicly?

Q. Yes.

A. That is correct, yes.

Q. And Ed Baldwin is your attorney, is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. It is on a remuneration basis, are you paying you attorney?

A. I haven't yet, it has been so recent that we really haven't gotten down to it. There has been one trivial discussion of money, but I really haven't had time to talk to him.

Q. Well, was it the tenor of it that you would pay the fee or he would look to someone else for his fee?

A. Well, I expect to pay him. His services are certainly worth something.

Q. I want to know who is paying your legal expenses?

A. Who is paying Mr. Baldwin?

Q. Yes.

A. I intend to pay him. I don't know of anyone else.

I expect to be billed by Mr. Baldwin and I expect to pay him. Incidentally that is going to be a problem the way things are going.

Q. Now the questions is, I am trying to nail down the time when you were disenchanted with the investigation and

you made a statement to a television camera that you had been acting as double agent.

- A. As I recall it, the day I tried to see Mr. Garrison and I was denied this privilege there were news media in the building and as I was leaving the building I was not asked if I was a double agent, as I recall I was not asked. The first mention of double agent was^{made}/by me. I had heard Mr. Garrison call people CIA agents that I said to the press, to the best of my recollection, under oath of course, that I am not a CIA agent and if I am called a double agent or something to that effect, that perhaps I was a double agent in this respect, working for Garrison and working for justice, the inference meaning at that time there was obviously a difference to me between Mr. Garrison's motives and justice.

MR. BURNES:

Were you then asked by a reporter when you became a double agent? Or words to that effect.

- A. I have never been, what I consider to be a double agent. I was simply trying to beat Mr. Garrison to the punch before I was called a CIA agent like he called people like William Boatner Reily who is 79 years old, and many, many others.

I was trying to beat him to the punch.

Q. The question is were you asked by the reporter when you first began to be a double agent?

A. I do not recall it being asked nor would I say that the local press at this point is very reliable.

Q. Do you recall being asked by the television camera why you had remained with the District Attorney's office since you did not agree with the arrest of Clay Shaw at the time and

A. Yes, I recall being asked that many times.

Q. ... and at that time you stated you did not agree with the arrest of Clay Shaw, is that correct?

A. I would say that is basically correct, yes.

Q. And did you reply that if I had not stayed with the office I would not be able to give this information today.

A. Whether those were my exact words or not, I don't know. As I recall the substance would be would I know as much as I do now, as an example, who would have been there to prevent the beating, wouldn't Sheridan and Townley have been beaten?

Q. That is what I want to know, were these your words?

A. I think substantially they are correct.

Q. Do these words mean that from March 1, 1967 on, you did

not consider yourself working for the District Attorney's office on this matter, but you were working with another purpose, to be the evidence for your personal purpose?

A. No, it did not. I never intended to mean that.

Q. Then that would mean that sometime after the arrest of Clay Shaw that you were disenchanted? With your association with the District Attorney's office?

A. Mr. Burnes, I don't know what is the matter with you. But when I became disenchanted was before the arrest of Clay Shaw. Maybe not to the point where my conscience bothered me, I was disenchanted when Mr. Ferrie was found dead, I was disenchanted when the Coroner ruled one way and Mr. Garrison ruled the other publicly. Things like that did disenchant me.

Q. When did you make the decision to leave the District Attorney's Office and take with you such information as you could come by, compile or collect?

A. The decision to leave came toward the late part of June, 1967, there was no exact date. Its on your mind every day, every night. I don't know the exact date.

Q. Now, if you made the statement on television that from that

moment on I was not working for Mr. Garrison, referring to March 1, 1967, if that statement were made, it would not be correct?

A. If the statement were made that from March 1, 1967 on I was not working for Mr. Garrison, it would be incorrect?

Q. If a statement of that substance was made by you it would be incorrect?

A. May I add this, that on June 10, 2 days after I saw Senator a Kennedy, I was in New York interviewing a witness for Mr. Garrison, I was still a member of the staff, telling Senator Kennedy what I did I do not deny it was in some way an act of disloyalty, but it was done in confidence because I felt like I wanted to do it and I have to bear that burden, but on June 10, and I gave the name of the woman we interviewed, and you were here, Mrs. Jaanice Tabor of 30 East 72 St. in New York City. I paid for the trip there and I paid for the trip home and I did it at Mr. Garrison's request, I did it when I got a note from Mr. Alcock saying Bill Gurvich, handle, and this pertained to calling or contacting a Dudley Doherty in Beeville, Texas, which I did. This led me to Mrs. Taber in New York. I would have helped him as late as that date hoping that he would stumble across

something.

Q. Bill, did either of your brothers, at your direction, or your

A. Please, may I speak to the Foreman for a second? If there is no investigation, Mr. Foreman, being made of me at this time, I would like it so stated before Judge Bernard Bagert at this time that I am not being investigated.

FOREMAN:

At this moment you are not being investigated.

A. Yes sir, and I am asking you if I am not, and this is not an act of distrust, but I have been advised by my attorney to ask that this be said before the Judge.

Q. I would have to refuse you.

A. All right, sir. I asked for it.

Q. I would like to ask a couple of questions. I want to get to what we brought you here for. You stated here - I am going back to what you said that the Federal Grand Jury or we should investigate the District Attorney's office, you said there were some illegal arrests in the District Attorney's office, and the only arrests you cited to us which the Grand Jury did not indict was Arcacha Smith and Gordon Novel. Do you know of any other illegal arrests by the District Attorney's office?

A. I consider the arrest of Morris Brownlee illegal. I base

this on the fact that the case was presented to the Grand Jury and refused and later when it was learned that Mr. Brownlee was associated or related to - I beg your pardon it was presented to the District Attorney and refused - and when it was learned that he was associated or related to the late Mr. Ferrie, it was suddenly reopened and the man was indicted. Whether new evidence had been established I don't know, because the investigation had been ended once it was refused.

MR. ALCOCK:

I don't know anything about this particular case, but I know it was an information and not an indictment.

FOREMAN:

All right, Brownlee you thought illegal, is there any one else that you know of?

A. No, offhand I can't recall.

Q. Let me ask you one other question? Up until you came in here two weeks ago I never heard of no one in the District Attorney's Office mentioning those names, Mr. Reily, Dr. Ochsner and Billy Monteleone, to this Grand Jury.

A. I never accused anyone in that office.

Q. Friday I heard it all over the street.

A. Certainly not from me. I have never revealed those names.

Q. Well, the only time it was ever mentioned was here.

A. Sir, other people knew about it. I gave you names of people I said who heard it. I don't know whether you summoned them or not. And I am telling you they heard it.

Q. Who did you tell it to besides us?

A. I don't recall telling them to anybody, but I will tell you this that when people see this question No. 3 about prominent people in New Orleans, they ask if it is Dr. Ochsner. Let me correct something, since my last meeting I told this to Mr. Reily - and I told it to Mr. William Helis, who is a personal friend of mine and Dr. Ochsner. I have not told Billy Monteleone.

JUROR:

What did you tell them?

A. Basically what has been discussed, that Mr. Garrison had given these names to members of the news media and saying they were CIA men and they were involved in this and involved in that and they were accessories after the fact.

Q. Involved in what?

A. In the death of the President, sir. I thought that was explicit. They were in some way involved in the assassination of President Kennedy.

Q. In the conspiracy?

A. No sir, accessories after the fact.

Q. I want to ask you one other question. This is a part of your testimony as fact.

MR. BURNES:

Q. Bill, you were quoted in saying that illegal acts were done by more than two, possibly more, of the District Attorney's staff. We ask whether or not Mr. Garrison was aware of this and the reply was he ordered it.

A. I don't know, I can't say if I was accurately quoted.

Q. Do you recall making this statement?

A. I recall saying he ordered it. But you ask me about the direct quote, I don't have the tape in front of me and I am not going to say yes it is or no it isn't. I did say he ordered it, that is a direct quote.

Q. I know that this is a direct quote and I/^{am}asking at this time do you know of any illegal acts which were done by as many as 2 members of the District Attorney's staff on instructions of Mr. Garrison?

A. Well, I could go back to this Arcacha-Novel thing, I don't think Mr. Garrison - he had, er - others - of course that was a true bill, a direct bill, er

Q. You remember you talked about your conscience.

A. Now you are going into something a little vague, I don't recall the exact names but I do remember saying that.

Q. You don't know the names of the 2 members of the staff who did illegal acts that you were referring to in your telecast?

A. I am sure I can think of them.

Q. Well would you please think of them now and give us the names?

A. Well, if you will continue I will think while you talk.

Q. I will be glad to pause while you think.

A. May I refer to this other thing, Mr. LaBiche, I am going to ask you again that if I am not under investigation may I be taken before Judge Bernard Bagert and have it so stated?

FOREMAN:

A. I have told you that you are not under investigation at this time, but you have made statements and we want to find out if they are true or false.

A. Sir, when I talk to you and the members of this Grand Jury I don't have the feeling that I am under investigation, but or cross-examines when Mr. Burnes questions/me I have the feeling I am.

Q. We talked to the District Attorney and told him things we wanted to know. We are concerned about your statements and you asked to come to us and we wanted to hear from you, now you have told us this bit of evidence here which, in my opinion, is your personal opinion, particularly in the assassination deal and you also made accusations about the

brow-
District Attorney's Office, about all this/beating and
illegal stuff going on, I want to know of one single
case and you can't give me one.

A. I gave you one where he ordered it. I know about it and told you.

MR. BURNES:

The statement was illegal acts had been done by at least 2
members of the District Attorney's staff and we asked if Mr.
Garrison knew of this and the answer was he ordered it. Who
were the members of the staff?

A. I will try to think and will give you the names, as soon as
I can recall which incident this is. You have picked out a
particular thing on television. I recall making a statement
that he ordered it, now you say there were two members of
the staff and what did they do.

JUROR:

If we did not want to get information from you we would not
be talking to you at all, no. 1. No. 2, If there are and
were illegal acts committed we need to know about it as a
matter of truth and as our duty to then investigate these
to find out the substance of them and the depth of them. This
is what we are trying to get to and you must know, you have
been an investigator and you must know, that you have to deal
in specifics, names and dates and what was done, and if we

don't have this type of information we are powerless to do anything, so this is why we are asking these questions. You say you sit up at night, I was up late last night, I worry too. And I worry for justice also. Now we want some direct answers and the time we had lunch together you and I sat next to each other and I commented to certain members of the Jury how impressed I was by you and from the conversation we had I even went to one of the people that I happen to know on Truth & Consequences and it was suggested that he go to the Chairman of that group and see that William Gurvich be reimbursed as it certainly seemed to me like he was doing a good job and working very hard. On one hand I was so impressed with your ability and experience and all of a sudden I find that you have a rather distrusting lack of knowledge on what we call very important matters.

A. On this one matter?

Q. Illegal acts are not something that a trained man, an investigator such as you, would just throw out not knowing full well what illegal action you were talking about and who were involved in it. This is what we need to know. You are too smart for this.

A. Well, now, he has quoted one thing ...

FOREMAN:

And you have given us nothing.

A. Well, sir, if I have given you nothing I prefer to make no further comment.

MR. BURNES:

I have propounded a question to you please answer it.

A. And I say I prefer not to make any further comments at all.

You heard the remark by Mr. LaBiche. And if I am to be forced to do it I request that I be permitted to confer with my attorney immediately.

FOREMAN:

We are not taking any of your rights away from you, there is nothing to see your attorney about. We are not questioning you along any line that would indict you.....

A. I don't believe you would, I really don't believe that you want to.

Q. ... I think you are wrong as hell in all that and I think the Jury thinks you are wrong. We thought you were going to tell us something. We all sit here and look for something and last time we were shocked at the news you said you had.

A. Well, I really ^{hadn't} ~~haven't~~ completed my testimony.

Q. And you come back here this time and we thought we would

get something but you put the same show on over again.

If you really wanted to be concerned I would say take a polygraph test with questions that we might have.

A. I would be happy to. May I do that at my expense?

Q. We are interested in law enforcement and I don't^{think}/you added nothing to the case, the Shaw case, something we are through with, and are trying to make news and this is just a bunch of news stuff as far as I am concerned. I don't think you have anything to tell us.

A. Well, I didn't think you did when I first came here.

Q. You asked to come here and we thought you had something, we were wrong, you don't. If I think there is something wrong with Mr. Garrison or any member of this staff I sure would like to know it. I don't think any man wants to sit^{here}/and think that you said that, that they could tolerate you.

A. Of course I will tell you this, that at the very beginning of the investigation pertaining to the burglary and breaking in of Clay Shaw's house, Mr. Lynn Loisel told me in the hallway, outside Mr. Garrison's office, I say this to you under oath, I say it to you as a believer in God, and I am just as big an American as you are sir,

Q. What was said?

A. That he said that Mr. Jim Garrison wanted Clay Shaw's home broken into and I laughed and said you are kidding and he said yes. The exact date I cannot say. I have stretched my memory as far as it could possibly go.

Q. Didn't he have a warrant to do this?

A. To break in, no. He told me that it was to be - and this was the peculiar part -

MR. ALCOCK:

Bill, you never told me this, why didn't you tell me this? You know I would have done something.

A. Would you, Jim? You already contradicted what I have said.

Q. I never contradicted what you said, I just told the gentlemen last week in your presence that when you and I came back from Houston that we got Garrison on the side and talked about his arresting Clay Shaw and he explained what Russo had said and we both agreed well, if that is what you've got, OK, we didn't know you had that. But you have never told me that Lynn Loisel told you that.

A. No, I don't recall telling you. I am saying it under oath however.

Q. I know you are. I am not doubting your word, I just wish you had told me that. Because you and I have gone in many times and talked to Mr. Garrison, when we didn't agree.

A. Jim, I have the highest regard for you and know you do for me.

I am saying it now under oath, if I didn't say it to you before. There are a lot of things I didn't say to you. Did I ever tell you that he ordered the beating of Sheridan and Townley?

Q. No, but you and I went out there, what I don't understand ...

A. It was after you left the stakeout when you had that surprise phone call -

Q. It was my wife.

A. Right. And you didn't believe that it was she on the phone. You left and then I went to Garrison's house. That is when it was.

JUROR:

Who was with you then, Mr. Gurvich?

A. What?

Q. Who was with you when you went to Mr. Garrison's house, at that time?

A. I was alone. When I went there I was alone.

Q. And that was the time he ordered you to beat and handcuff Sheridan.....

A. Well, there were other officers involved, there was a stake-out, you see, and we had one or two units around, like I was going to do the recording and others were going to take movies and I went to report to Mr. Garrison that these people with whom Sheridan and Townley were to make contact and

they called and said they were delayed and then I went to tell him they were delayed and this is what happened. The ~~stake~~-out was no more than 4 or 5 minutes from Garrison's house.

JUROR:

May I ask again, who was with you when Mr. Garrison said go out and get Sheridan and get him and handcuff him and bring him in.

A. Who was in the building?

Q. Who was with you when this statement was made?

A. This order was given, I went there alone, there were other people in the house.

Q. No one was there but you?

A. No sir. Mr. Ivon and Mr. Loisel were there, but whether they heard, I can't

Q. But nobody carried out the order?

A. I never said it was. I said the District Attorney ordered it now I could be wrong, but I say this is unethical. But I will swear that in my opinion it is unethical.

Q. But nothing was ever done?

A. They didn't show, and it wouldn't have been done if I was around. I don't resort to violence, the beatings of people and handcuffs.

He clenched his fist and he said I want them physically beaten, like that.

Q. You don't think it was just a figure of speech?

A. No sir, I don't

FOREMAN:

Q. Bill, you couldn't have misinterpreted that like you did the thing coming up the steps today?

A. I still say

Q. I have to say that, to be honest with you.

A. How do you know, Mr. LaBiche, that I misinterpreted Mr. Burnes, when you didn't hear him. Is it something that Mr. Burnes told you. You didn't hear it, Mr. LaBiche. I am not being facetious, and looking for an argument.

Q. Well, I am trying to do the right job -

A. And I am telling you, Mr. LaBiche, that the man, one of the investigators said to me that Mr. Garrison ordered someone to break into Clay Shaw's house, this would have been prior to February 1st, to the best of my recollection.

Q. But it wasn't done?

A. I don't give a darn, I say its a serious - I don't know for a fact that it wasn't, I am telling you what a man told me. You want to get Mr. Loisel and ask him, under oath. God

knows what answer you may get, but I don't fear anyone, I fear only God. And I am not a flag waver, and I am not

bringing religion into it. You can check my credibility.

MR. BURNES:

Well, let's keep it down to the question I asked you.

Who were the 2 members of Mr. Garrison's staff that he ordered to do illegal acts?

A. Did I specifically say 2, you haven't proven to me that I did. I have said a lot of things, I don't have a record of any of that.

Q. You said he ordered at least as many as 2 staff members to do illegal acts.

A. He ordered the physical beating and Mr. Loisel and Mr. Ivon were in the home at the time and in the den.

Q. Your statement wasn't that Mr. Garrison ordered them, but that illegal acts were being done and

A. Now you are going by - you are quoting something that I don't have a record of in front of me. Its your memory against mine.

Q. Let me put it in a way where it won't be my memory against yours. Did the 2 members of the District Attorney's staff, to your knowledge, perform illegal acts on the orders of Mr. Garrison?

A. Was it illegal or unethical, now, let's see

Q. I am not going to change my questions, I am going to leave it exactly as it is.

A. Did anybody in the D.A.'s office

Q. Did 2 members of Garrison's staff perform illegal acts on his orders?

A. I don't remember - I am having trouble with that -

Q. Do you know? Is the answer yes, no, or I don't know?

A. I don't remember.

Q. You don't remember whether they did or whether you said this?

JUROR:

Did they do it? That is the question.

A. I don't know.

JUROR:

Bill, I don't know whether you are getting tired or what.

But that would be the most important answer you could give us right now, that one answer. The names of these people who did illegal acts, and one of the illegal acts they did - that's what we want. Then we have something to hang our hat on. If you can give us that answer. Not things that were said - and unethical and illegal are by far two different things. Like black and white. Illegal we are interested in, not unethical. An illegal act performed by one or more than one of the D.A.'s assistants. That is what we want. If you have one.

FOREMAN:

Bill Reid is supposed to have asked you - supposed to have asked you anything. Bribery, any bribery - certain investiga-

tors in the District Attorney's office -

A. Bribery?

JUROR:

well, we keep asking Bill about these things and he says
he can't remember, we are wasting our time.

JUROR:

Mr. Gurvich, did you work on the NBC documentary?

A. No, I had absolutely nothing to do with it.

Q. Were you used as a consultant perhaps?

A. Never. In no way.

Q. Nobody from NBC contacted you in any regard to the investigation?

A. Yes, they did.

Q. What did you contribute to them?

A. Nothing.

Q. What was the nature of the contact?

A. The nature of the contact was to this effect, that a person
of your ability knows there is nothing to the investigation
will you appear on this NBC thing, and I said no.

Q. Was this to Walter Sheridan?

A. Yes. He contacted me numerous times and maybe as far back as May.
Definitely the month of June.

Q. Did you make any of these files available to Mr. Sheridan?

A. Not one word.

Q. To anybody at NBC?

A. No indeed.

Q. To the NBC, CBS or ABC staffs?

A. No.

Q. You gave them no information at all in regard to the investigation?

A. Prior to the NBC showing?

Q. At any time.

A. I have made comments since the NBC showing, I might have said things like there is nothing to it, hell, I have been quoted and everything. But as far as anything pertinent is concerned, no, my personal opinion as to whether there was anything to it or not, yes I expressed myself, but not before.

Q. Did you receive any remuneration from NBC or any of these people?

A. Sir, I rendered no services and I received no reward at all.

Q. Did they buy you an airplane ticket, or anything like that?

A. I bought my own and it was charged to my account.

FOREMAN:

You gave the District Attorney a television set, the question somebody asked is did you bug it?

A. Mr. Garrison was worried about what I did - but I didn't.

Q. Why did you give it to him?

A. Why?

Q. Yes, why?

A. It was Christmas time - and I had been a dollar a year member of his staff so I had my younger brother, Leonard, and we went to an electronics place where we buy wholesale small radios, batteries and equipment , and we bought that for him, we bought a radio for Charlie Ward. Mr. Ward brought his home.

JUROR:

Are you a rich man?

A. No sir.

Q. What is your source of income? How can you afford to be a

A. dollar a year man?

A. When I was a dollar a year man I had nothing to do for Mr. Garrison, it was a semi-honorary thing, but with the

Q. What is the source of your income?

A. I get my money from my business.

Q. Detective Agency?

A. Yes sir. We employ 200 people and I have done that 21 years. Since 1930.

Q. While you are away your brothers operate the business and you receive a proportion of the share?

A. Yes sir.

MR. BURNES:

Bill, do you have any expectations of becoming a political figure as a result of this?

A. I have never given it a thought.

Q. Would there be any motivation in your meeting with Senator Kennedy?

A. No sir. In fact I have never had that asked before until now.

Q. Have you discussed with anyone the possible^{political}/ramifications of this course of action?

A. Ramifications? No sir. I think Mr. Garrison has political motivation, I don't.

Q. JUROR:

The last time you said Carlos Quiroga was one of the cases, did you? You cited him as being one of the cases.

A. Yes, I did. ^{since then} And/I have read the master file and I don't recall reading it before, and in it it is reported there in the master file, given me by Mr. Garrison, that to the effect that Mr. Quiroga had been asked to take a lie detector test and refused and there was a note at the bottom saying ask him again and another thing I had seen Mr. Quiroga brought in* and I had heard what Mr. Garrison had to say , infact he went to Mr. Quiroga - pertaining to the polygraph - I think it was

was voluntary - and when a person is asked to take it and refuses, that is the end of it, unless something new comes up, later on. IN January of 1967 I was summoned to Mr. Garrison's house and I was told that his then star witness, David Lewis, had been shot at on Chartres Street near St. Louis, and he was assembling members of his staff to investigate this. They were going to this intersection of St. Louis and Chartres across from the Royal Orleans, the Old Court House, and search for the bullet. This was about 10:30 or 11:00 o'clock at night. I did not participate in this, first, I did not believe Mr. Lewis' story, I went to Brennan's and had dinner with Life Magazine editor, Mr. Billings, the next day I took Mr. Lewis and put him on polygraph and showed that he had lied about the whole thing. After the test I talked to him and he said I don't know why I did it and yes, I lied. I wanted to make myself a big man with Mr. Garrison and I told him, I said, well, if you are married and got a couple of kids and a steady job you have a hell of a lot more than a lot of people and he told me he had received a psychiatric discharge from the Navy but the night that Mr. Garrison summoned me to his home, the night that some members of his staff did indeed search for a bullet, but

there was no bullet, that night was the first time Carlos Quiroga was mentioned to me. It was Mr. Garrison who said, before anyone left his home to go search in this investigation, that Mr. Quiroga was the man in the green automobile who fired the shot at Lewis, there was a 2 day stake-out at Mr. Quiroga's house at Mr. Garrison's instructions. On Derby Place out in Gentilly. If Mr. Quiroga was to show with any Latin type people they were all to be arrested. This was prior to the polygraph, prior to Mr. Lewis' admission that he lied and these people would have been tried for attempted murder, based on a psychiatric person.

JUROR:

May I ask you this? In your investigation

- A. Now Mr. Quiroga - now I say this is a frightening - I don't say it is a professional type of thing, I don't think it is an ethical type of thing - that one person tell you for some reason without him giving you a description anywhere near the identify of Carlos Quiroga that he would say stake it out and if he shows with Latins - why Latins - everybody is entitled to their theory, but you can only go so far with a theory, you can check your theory out but you had better get something to support it or drop it and look for another theory, you can run out of theories. But Mr. Quiroga had

he appeared with Latins would indeed have been arrested - and you know what, I would have arrested him - but he didn't appear at all. Mr. Garrison was convinced. I did not know on what grounds, I was new in the investigation. But that is a frightening thing, and that gets into the personality of Mr. Garrison.

JUROR:

You must be getting a little more refreshed, you remembered in detail what happened there, now about these illegal acts in the District Attorney's Office on those 2 D.A.'s, who are they?

A. I am trying to recall exactly what it was, I am certainly not evading it. I wouldn't have said it if I didn't have something to talk about.

Q. Your memory was so sharp there I thought it had come back to you.

A. Its sharp, my mind is sharp, you better believe it.

JUROR:

Mr. Gurvich, on your trip to see Senator Kennedy did some one suggest this trip to you?

A. No sir.

Q. You thought about it yourself?

A. Yes sir.

Q. When you thought about seeing Mr. Kennedy did you have a way

of seeing him, you did not know him? How did you arrange it?

A. I asked Mr. Sheridan if he would arrange it for me.

Q. In other words, you concluded that you wanted to see Mr. Kennedy before you asked Mr. Sheridan?

A. Yes sir.

Q. In other words, that was the way it happened, the order in which it happened? You wanted to see Mr. Kennedy and you asked Sheridan to arrange it, is that right?

A. Yes.

JUROR:

What is it that makes you so certain that the District Attorney does not have a valid case?

A. Well, I got involved with Mr. Garrison's staff in December of 1966, and I ran out one thing and another and I could never develop anything to substantiate or corroborate Mr. Garrison's theories. On February 20th Mr. Garrison had a press conference at which time he said to the world - I can't quote him, but I will give you the substance - I have had it solved, I know who the people are, I know the cities in which they live. At that time Mr. Shaw was not a suspect. As I recall Mr. Shaw was interviewed on Christmas Eve of '66, very briefly, based on the fact that he was

a suspected homosexual and his first name was Clay and similar to that of Clay Bertrand, which is mentioned in the Warren Report, and that he lived in the French Quarter where this alleged Clay Bertrand was supposed to have lived also. I do not know how long the interview with Shaw lasted but he left and went to Hammond for the holidays. I did not hear Mr. Garrison mention his name to the news men , it was new to me when I got in, I did not hear him mention Shaw. Then some news people mentioned to him what about this fellow Shaw and he said his case is cleared up, there is nothing to that. During the month of January, 1967 David Lewis was Mr. Garrison's chief witness, this is the one with the psychiatric discharge from the Navy and who was shot at, who lied. David Ferrie was the suspect in November of 1963, the day of the assassination. According to Government reports Secret Service and FBI sent down word to see Jack Martin. Jack Martin was somewhat of a character, a down and outer. I did not know that at the time, I know that now. I had never heard of him, but he worked for the late Guy Banister, who was considered to be an extreme right winger. They talked and they cleared him, to Martin and they talked to him/and if you look into the Secret Service and FBI reports they describe him as a

character, a person with a reputation for lying, police officers, attorneys and others, and as an alcoholic.

According to the master file Mr. Martin, this was in '63, phoned here to Herman Kohlman, who was then connected with the District Attorney's Office, and said if you want to look into something pertaining to the assassination look into David William Ferrie. Mr. Kohlman did what he should have done he reported it to his office, to Mr. Klein. They started on Mr. Ferrie and they found out that Mr. Ferrie, maybe I am telling you things that you know, but when you ask a question like that you go back, way back, and they checked and found out that after the Carlos Marcello trial there was a victory party at the Royal Orleans, the day after the assassination, after which Ferrie and two of his friends went to Houston. I assume this, along with Mr. Garrison and whoever was in his office as investigators, they went from Houston to Galveston to Alexandria, and Mr. Ferrie was working for Ray Gill, and he contacted Mr. Gill who told him there was big trouble down here, he went to his apartment, he dropped the kid off to go get his clothes, and when the kid got there he was arrested by members of the District Attorney's Office. This was in Jefferson Parish.

When the boy didn't come back with his clothes he went to Hammond, La. to Southeast College, when he did return he was picked up by the District Attorney's Office and questioned and released to the FBI, who immediately cleared him of any implication of the President's death. Then it was a dormant situation, it was all forgotten about until the fall of 1966. Mr. Martin appeared again in the District Attorney's Office and the whole investigation was reopened and for a while Mr. Martin was a key source of information. And now he is again a key source of information, not so much for Mr. Garrison but for reporters in the States Item and the Times-Picayune, and part of this file that I have contains notes from Mr. Hoke May and from Mr. Garrison himself about referring to Jack Martin, who is considered by everyone as unreliable, an alcoholic and a psychopath.

MR. BURNES:

May I ask you a question - you stated that on February 20th Mr. Garrison had a press conference and that Shaw was not a suspect?

A. To my knowledge.

Q. Are you unaware of my memorandum in the file that I talked to

Clay Shaw on February 7, it was Mardi Gras Day is the reason I remember it, Feb. 6, which would be at least two weeks prior to this date, and I had assignment long under advisement to establish ownership of the apartment in the block in which he lived.

A. I don't remember seeing that in the file.

Q. Well, the memorandum is in the file, apparently you were not consulted in that stage of the investigation. I know the memorandum is in the file, I dictated it.

A. Well, I am under oath and I am telling you what I saw, and you are not under oath. You could very well be right, Mr. Burnes, but I have made my statement.

Q. Your statement that Shaw was not a suspect means not to your knowledge.

A. Of course, ~~not~~ to my knowledge. How do I know if you considered him a suspect, or Mr. Alcock, or anybody else. I don't know what you all think.

Q. The point that I am trying to clear is that what you mean is that you did not know that Shaw was a suspect.

A. Well, its all my opinion. I think that is understood.

JUROR:

The Shaw case is over, we have no jurisdiction over the Shaw case now. We discussed this the last time you came here.

A. When I came here the first time I thought you did.

Q. The reason we called you back here was not to continue the Shaw case.

MR. BURNES:

I withdraw the question.

FOREMAN:

We were concerned about the original accusations made.

JUROR:

I would like to ask a question? You were asked to appear before this Jury and you voluntarily intimated that you were going to back up certain allegations and charges made, now did you really expect us to act on something like this? This is all you have given us?

A. Nosir. I can only be asked 15 questions, that was it. This man picks 3, 4 or 5 questions and asks you 3 or 4 times. It takes all day.

Q. We can't act on this.

A. I'm not asking you act on this.

Q. Do you have anything in your files that we could act on?

A. Well, I don't know what is important to you and what isn't. I think some things in here are very important. But I have been led to believe by the Grand Jury that they are not.

Q. An illegal act, that is important.

Q. Give us one fact, you are supposed to be an investigator.

You have not given us one single fact. I am trying to lay it on the line. You go around and say what all these people are saying - that is unimportant. I think every one of the Jury are thinking what I am telling you and I think I am speaking for all of them when I say you don't have nothing. You haven't given us one thing to go on.

A. Well, they are entitled to their opinion and I am entitled to mine.

Of course I did not expect you to act on this, but I thought they were serious things.

JUROR:

Do you think we can build a case in court with this?

A. No, I am not asking you to go to court. I actually thought the Grand Jury could draw up an indictment.

Q. What is the significance of No. 10 - did Garrison discuss in your presence the desire to extend the time for the New Orleans Parish Grand Jury for another six months? And the answer is yes. What is the purpose of that?

A. What is the purpose of that?

Q. Yes, what is the significance of that, I am interested in that too.

A. Because it was an unprecedented thing and it was my opinion that Mr. Garrison is of the opinion that he can get most

anything he wants out of you people.

Q. In other words, your inference there is that we were patsys and he wanted to keep us around.

A. Now, now, I am not going to insult you.

Q. Well, I am really interested in that question..

A. You have a legal advisor and you have every reason in the world to believe in him when he appears before you, and says this is that.

Q. You mean by that -

A. I actually don't recall putting that question in there myself. I think my attorney might have put that in there. There was another that wasn't a favorite of mine. This was simply to say all right, look

Q. You have favorite questions?

A. Sir?

Q. Some of these questions have no weight or significance, the fact that Garrison disagreed/about bringing Bundy into court, I can't see nothing criminal about disagreeing between 3 legal minds.

A. Well, all I can say is bring in the polygraph operator and put him under oath, sir. That is your responsibility.

- Q. And the disagreements in here - like Ward advising him that the Grand Jury could not be continued. I don't see any weight to this.
- A. Well, ask Mr. Ward if he told him that Bundy couldn't be trusted, that he had lied, ask the polygraph operator, he is available, he might still be in the building. I gave you the names.
- Q. What you are saying in essence is - if I understand correctly - I have assistants, they render their opinions to me and sometimes they do it rather vociferously, and we disagree, but in the final analysis I am going to make the decision and where there is disagreement between the District Attorney and his assistants, it is his responsibility to make the final decision. The ultimate decision is up to him.
- A. But wouldn't he depend upon what they said?
- Q. Well it would depend upon what they said and whether he agreed with what they said was the right interpretation and so on. I have seen these fellows disagree between themselves right in here, but I am happy to say they are not all yes men. I am happy that they do this. This is very healthy. I have my own opinion ^{as to} ~~and~~ why No. 10 question was asked since your attorney made up the questions.

A. No, sir, I wouldn't say he made them up, I never said that. I said he participated in it so did the examiner.

Q. You said you did not know this question was in there - you did not put it in that he did.

A. Yes, I believe that to be true.

Q. Maybe he felt that it was going to be asked?

A. Oh yes, I knew it was going to be asked - Oh, of course, they tell you before, you are going to be asked this, this and this - oh, I know word for word. I am not saying I am surprised, what I mean is when they were compiled.

JUROR:

Do you have any other evidence than that?

A. Not at this time, no.

Q. In the future time, you think you might have some?

Q. You said something about a brief case - would there be any evidence in there?

A. No, I didn't know what my attorney had out there. All he had was a lot of Xerox and an empty folder.

Q. Well, did he have any other evidence or charges of any sort?

A. In here?

Q. Anywhere.

A. Well, I said before that I would like for you to hear witnesses before you under oath and say that one of Mr.

Garrison's witnesses against Shaw, under oath in court, admitted to them that he lied. I gave you the names before. And I can tell you suspicions which perhaps you should not even consider, since they are suspicions. But I'll point out something to you like this, and this is not what it is based on, but I am not stupid and I do have 21 years experience. And you may laugh at me for some things but you do not have the experience that I have had. Nor do I have it in the field that you do. As an example, I never could understand the point in hypnotizing Russo on March 12th, 2 days before the preliminary hearing, which was 2 weeks after the defendant's arrest. I could never understand the point of 2 State witnesses staying in the court during the preliminary hearing while all the other witnesses were told to stay out in the hallway. I say this is suspicious. I have my belief

JUROR:

If you say, as you have, that you believe in God, conscience, and all, it seems to me that you would have something better prepared so somebody could take some action and get to the point where somebody could get or take action, that is if you feel so strongly about it.

A. Well, as I said before, if I was advised that this polygraph

meant nothing to you

- Q. We have accepted the polygraph test as part of the record.
But you have given us nothing of substance as yet - nothing to go on.
- Q. Let me ask, is it customary to give out questions before they take a lie detector test?

MR. BURNES:

Yes, I have talked to more than one polygraph examiner and they do tell you the questions in advance.

JUROR:

- Q. Bill, give us one name - one name of a person who did an illegal act?
- A. I gave you Mr. Garrison's name.
- Q. What was the illegal act ordered by Mr. Garrison to be done by someone on the staff of the District Attorney's Office? And what was the act done?

JUROR:

To give a command and execute the order are two different things.

- A. Is it wrong to give the command?
- Q. Was it executed?
- A. That's the part I am questioning.

Q. FOREMAN:

It's not unusual for people to make accusations to get re-
actions. Now if we had that act that was executed, the

name of the person who committed the act, we could move, we could do something.

JUROR:

Mr. Gurvich, let me ask you this? On these instructions to go out and bring in these people - I know you are a qualified man and have had a lot of experience in this business - but do you honestly believe - suppose this had been carried out, somebody had gone out and beaten up these two people that are mentioned, not two bums now, but two fellows who practically own rights to television stations, do you really believe that anybody in their right mind could think do anything like that? Do you honestly/that anybody in their right mind would order two such people beaten up, handcuffed and brought in?

A. I did not say the person who ordered it was in his right mind.

Q. I am asking you, would you think that anybody in their right mind would honestly and sincerely tell somebody to do that and mean for it to be done?

A. They wouldn't be the first people beaten up, not by the D.A.'s office, but had been arrested.

Q. I am speaking about these proportions though. Do you honestly believe that somebody would do something of this magnitude?

Go out and do what I would call an insane act?

A. ^{would,} Do I think someone ~~one~~, I think somebody would. I think

some people are capable of doing it, yes.

Q. Do you think Mr. Garrison is in this category?

A. Of permitting violence?

Q. Of ordering this to be done, knowing the consequences of such an act? No matter who it was. Do you sincerely believe this?

I'm asking this in the same vein

A. I don't know what frame of mind he was in when he ordered it.

Q. Well, you were the only one there, you can judge his frame of mind.

A. I didn't say I was the only one there.

Q. I asked before who was there and you couldn't recall anyone.

A. I told you Mr. Ivon and Mr. Loisel were there in the house and I said I can't swear that they heard it.

Q. That's what we are talking about - if they heard it.
know

A. I don't/whether they heard it, they don't know if I heard it.

Yes, I believe he was serious when he said it.

Q. He would really have wanted that to be done, go out and have these men beaten and handcuffed and brought in. You honestly believe that?

A. At that time, yes. I don't know what frame of mind he was.

Q. You obviously believed it then and you obviously still believe it.

A. I must believe it or I would not have passed it on the test here, nor would I have said to you under oath.

Q. You place a lot of confidence in this, don't you?

A. It depends on who conducts them?

Q. You place a lot of confidence in the polygraph?

A. Not in any, no sir.

Q. Why in this one?

A. Because this one was done by the most renowned person in the world, as I understand it.

Q. Why would you not have confidence in other polygraph tests?

A. Because their examiners don't conduct their examinations like perhaps others, whereas if you go to the Keeley Institute, the founder of the polygraph, in Chicago also, the qualifications to go there for training are much less than any other, well not than any other, Mr. John E. Reid

Q. What is your opinion of the polygraph test and technicians here?
them as good as

A. I don't regard/John Reid or any of his examiners. Because they have by far more experience.

Q. You accept anything that came from John Reid & Associates?

A. Oh yes, anything. But I would not have gone to them and ask for a test. There are local people, I know Eddie O'Donnell and I know Captain _____. I would say they are competent, but not as competent as Reid, whom I had never met, but whose reputation preceded him. If any of these witnesses want to appear before you should I tell them to contact you in some way?

FOREMAN:

Yes, but we are not interested in the Clay Shaw case.

We did not call you for that. We are interested in the accusations you made in regard to malfeasance in the District Attorney's Office and we are interested in that.

A. Any time?

Q. Any time you want.

A. Then extend this one courtesy to me. And I am not lying to you when I say this, when I drop first names. I did not think I was summoned by this Grand Jury, I thought I was summoned by the District Attorney's Office to be investigated.

Q. What difference would it make?

A. It makes a heck of a lot of difference to me, sir.

Q. You didn't understand it from the last time you were here?

A. Yes sir, the last time - now I am talking about what the papers said - this might not be fair but again you people have a paper, you have one in front of you, and this man said certainly, positively not I had nothing of significant to say or give.

A. We have told you the proceedings of the Grand Jury are secret. So how can you read about it in the papers? Nobody comes in here when we make our decisions.

A. No, I didn't think they did, I am not saying that.

Q. You also commented on how unreliable the local papers are.

A. Yes sir.

Q. And you said they misquoted you several times.

A. Yes sir.

Q. Then why do you believe them? We gave you two weeks to come back with information and evidence, regardless of what you read in the papers.

Q. I have told Bill if he does have some direct and specific information regarding illegal ^{we} acts I would like to know about it, now Bill you want us to extend that courtesy to you and we would like a similar courtesy, extended to us by you, that give us the information without having it aired in the public light which makes it a little awkward for everyone concerned. If you have something bring it to us and don't let me sit down by my TV set and find out about it, this raises questions of motive and everything else.

FOREMAN:

Thank you, Bill.

C E R T I F I C A T E

I certify that the preceding transcript is a true and correct copy of the testimony given, under oath, in the preceding matter, before the Orleans Parish Grand Jury, on the 12th day of July, 1967, and reduced to typewriting by me.

Maureen B. Ship

